



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/765,049	01/28/2004	Tetsunori Koda	118487	9603
25944	7590	09/20/2006		
OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC P.O. BOX 19928 ALEXANDRIA, VA 22320			EXAMINER RICKMAN, HOLLY C	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1773	
DATE MAILED: 09/20/2006				

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/765,049

Applicant(s)

KODA ET AL.

Examiner

Holly Rickman

Art Unit

1773

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 30 June 2006.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-13 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 10-12 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-9 and 13 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 28 January 2004 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>7/13/04, 1/28/04</u> . | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Election/Restrictions

1. Claims 10-12 are withdrawn from further consideration pursuant to 37 CFR 1.142(b) as being drawn to a nonelected species, there being no allowable generic or linking claim. Election was made **with** traverse in the reply filed on 6/30/06. The traversal is on the grounds that the search of both species could be made without a serious burden on the examiner. The examiner respectfully disagrees. The added search that would be necessitated by examination of claims 10-12 would place an undue burden on the examiner. The examiner agrees with applicant that claims 1-9 and 13 are generic but notes that at this time there are no allowable generic claims.

Upon the allowance of a generic claim, applicant will be entitled to consideration of claims to additional species which depend from or otherwise require all the limitations of an allowable generic claim as provided by 37 CFR 1.141. If claims are added after the election, applicant must indicate which are readable upon the elected species. MPEP § 809.02(a).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Art Unit: 1773

3. Claims 1-9 and 13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Oikawa et al. (US 2002/0136929) in view of Wood et al. (US 5041922).

Oikawa et al. disclose a magnetic recording medium having a substrate, an underlayer and multiple magnetic recording layers formed from CoCrPt alloys containing an oxide such as SiO₂. The reference discloses the use of several oxide amounts which fall within the range set forth in claim 4, including 7 mol% SiO₂. The reference teaches a method of making the magnetic recording medium which involves deposition of each of the aforementioned layers on a substrate.

Oikawa et al fails to disclose an embodiment wherein the oxide content is higher in the magnetic layer closer to the underlayer. However, Oikawa et al. teaches that it is advantageous to provide magnetic layers having different compositions wherein this difference is achieved by changing the oxide concentration in each layer. Given this teaching, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to adjust the concentration of the magnetic layer closest to the underlayer to have an oxide concentration *either* higher or lower than that of the overlying magnetic layers in order to achieve improvement over a structure having the same concentration of oxide in each magnetic layer. See Oikawa et al., paragraphs 48, 49, 51 and 63.

The examiner acknowledges that the reference suggests that it is *preferred* to lower the oxide concentration of the magnetic layer closest to the underlayer as compared to the other magnetic layers. However, the examiner maintains that a fair reading of the reference would suggest that the any difference in oxide concentration of the magnetic layers is preferable to the

Art Unit: 1773

use of the same oxide concentration across the layers. Thus, it would also have been obvious to increase the oxide concentration of the lowermost magnetic layer.

Oikawa et al. also fails to disclose the use of a soft magnetic underlayer.

Wood et al. teach that it is known in the art to add a soft magnetic underlayer to a longitudinal recording medium in order to improve magnetic recording properties. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to add a soft magnetic keeper layer above the substrate taught by Oikawa et al. in order to improve magnetic recording performance.

The examiner further notes that the limitation of claim 1 requiring a magnetic recording medium "based on a perpendicular magnetic recording system" has been considered. The limitation is a preamble limitation and merely constitutes a statement of intended use. It does not materially distinguish the present claims from the prior art.

4. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Holly Rickman whose telephone number is (571) 272-1514. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday 9:30-6:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Carol Chaney can be reached on (571) 272-1284. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 1773

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Holly Rickman", with a stylized flourish at the end.

Holly Rickman
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 1773

hcr
September 18, 2006